

Relations between SGWU and Loyola - Historical Survey.

November 25, 1968: The minutes of the first meeting of the Sir George Committee on Cooperation with Loyola College summarise developments to date as follows: Informal discussions between faculty and students have taken place over the past two to three years. In May or June hints were dropped by government officials about the desirability for some form of joint venture. The two Principals met informally but could see little advantage - rather a putting together of deficits. In November, Wynne Dickson and Germain Gauthier from the Department of Education met the two Principals to discuss university-level education for the English-language population of Montreal. It was suggested that long-range planning look at a one-campus institution because of the cost of further downtown development. SGWU affirmed the value of its downtown location. "The outcome of this meeting was a decision that joint deliberations would take place to identify the educational and economic value of possible cooperation between Sir George and Loyola in their proposed growth and development programmes." The two institutions agreed to set up working groups to explore areas of cooperation and coordination, and report by Christmas.

December 3, 1968: SGWU issued a press release expressing agreement to "proceed to discuss a full and complete merger with Loyola of Montreal". The Principal is quoted as follows: "This action is necessary in order to enhance the opportunities for post-secondary

/2...

students in English language university education in the Province of Quebec". The release refers to better utilization of human and physical resources and savings in basic expenditures. "The objective, as identified by the Committee, is to integrate the facilities and services of both institutions. Where, by their very nature, some departments cannot be combined, separate identity would be respected."

December 5, 1968: Father Malone asked that a statement be read into the minutes of the Loyola/Sir George Steering Committee expressing the severe reservations of the Loyola Board and Alumni regarding the above release. "A move towards a complete merger would never have been initiated by Loyola's Board or Alumni or by the English Catholic community."

December 12, 1968: It was agreed to set up three task forces to investigate possible areas of cooperation: Arts, Science and Engineering, and Commerce. They were to report by February 15, 1969.

January 7, 1969: While the Joint Steering Committee seemed in favour of "integration of Loyola and Sir George into a single voice to protect the rights of the English language community", Loyola insisted that discussions must consider alternatives to merger, namely, federation, affiliation and forms of cooperation.

/3...

SGWU representatives considered that the government preferred complete merger. "The general public and indeed an element on the French side feel that merger is obvious." Loyola suggested broadening the scope of the review to include McGill and Marianopolis. SGWU felt the government both saw advantages in the "countervailing balance of a second block" and considered there was room for two, but not three, English-language universities on the Island of Montreal. There was no advantage in talks with McGill "because size then becomes objectionable."

January 13, 1969: It was reported in the SGWU Committee minutes that Loyola was "showing a certain apathy...If the little activity shown by Loyola continues, then Sir George will have to go it alone."

January 15, 1969: In a letter to Germain Gauthier, then Director General of Higher Education, the secretaries of the Joint Steering Committee reported that, while SGWU supported "full merger", Loyola wished that "the advantages not only of merger but also of federation, affiliation and association without a formal legal structure be concurrently studied".

February, 1969: The task forces reported, but it is clear they did not get far beyond an exchange of data and opinions. Statements in the reports indicate the climate of discussion: "While the SGWU Committee were seeking to understand the implica-

/4...

tions for the Arts Faculty of any possible relation with Loyola ranging from merger through informal cooperation, it was apparent that Loyola placed foremost (a) its character as a Catholic College; (b) its distinctive educational characteristics as expressed in compulsory courses in classics (translated), theology and philosophy; (c) its unwillingness to restrict its autonomy. ...There seemed to be no sense of urgency expressed by Loyola and as yet, little in the way of creative approach to problems facing Arts education.

"Loyola presented a view that gave them a simple solution including autonomy, Catholic character and continuing as they are. It would involve, in effect, handing the charter of SGWU over to a third body - a central advisory Council of nine, with both schools continuing as "universities" under general academic policy set down by this group. The present impression is that discussions by the Task Force are producing nothing. SGWU will have to come up with an over-all plan without much help from Loyola."

This Arts report, presumably emanating from the SGWU representatives, was not signed. A simultaneous report signed by the Loyola representatives stated: "Their (the SGWU representatives) stance was too rigid....They were not willing to discuss other possibilities of cooperation. They listened politely when we presented our views, and then came right back to ways and means of effecting merger."

"It was agreed that, on the basis of the available facilities, it was reasonable to suppose that the Science Faculties should merge completely, and be located in the present Sir George Williams

/5...

building." Reference is then made to the problems this might create for Arts and Commerce students on the assumption that these Faculties were likely to be located at Loyola. ..."Father Graham wished it recorded that there was some fear on the part of some members of the Faculty of Science at Loyola that the various departments would be absorbed or swallowed up in a complete merger, thus losing all identity. This was not considered a serious deterrent to the idea of merger of the Science Faculties.".

The Engineering report consisted of the unofficial minutes of one meeting. It contained the following statement: "Loyola held that Loyola's Engineering pursued humanistic goals not pursued by SGWU, and hence it was no more germane to cooperation to study the fusion of Loyola Engineering and SGWU's than it was to study a fusion of SGWU's Engineering with SGWU's Science. Loyola held that it was unrealistic to expect a new senate to appreciate the difference in goals between Loyola's Engineering and SGWU's Engineering and confirm their separate existence."

One meeting of the Commerce task force was reported by the Dean of the Loyola Commerce Faculty. He concluded: "It seemed to the observers from Loyola that the representatives of Sir George Williams University were more concerned about political pressures and the lack of space for their five year programme rather than the practical and philosophical problems of any type of affiliation."

/6...

March 13, 1969: Michel Despland prepared a report on behalf of the SGWU Committee. He noted that: "Loyola College has formulated conditions for cooperation (such as the preservation of the Loyola identity, and its Catholic character) which seem to rule out merger as a possible solution... There is a possibility of working out a federation between the two institutions. A federated University College of Arts and Loyola College of Arts would however bear much resemblance to some solutions envisaged under the heading of merger. As for a federation between an autonomous Loyola College with four faculties and an autonomous SGWU with four faculties this would turn out to be only affiliation under a different name. We fail to see how this would be in the interest of SGWU. We also fail to see how this would provide the English-speaking community of Montreal with an economically arrived at new wealth of educational opportunities. ...We still want to discuss cooperation with Loyola. The atmosphere of frankness and cordiality which permeated our talks convinced us that we can move forward with time."

March 25, 1969: The Joint Steering Committee agreed that Loyola should produce a comparable paper for internal use. The Committee should then look at both papers. The joint secretaries should prepare a progress report to submit to the Minister. The meeting also explored the implications of federation. It was generally agreed that each party would consider federation 1) in terms of the proposed structure and 2) in terms of whether other institutions could be brought into the federation.

/7...

March 28, 1969: Loyola produced its paper. It contained the following comments: "The Loyola committee understands that integration or merger with SGWU is one form of association, and not necessarily the form that is favoured by the Department of Education... The Loyola committee is not convinced that the arguments in favour of complete integration of the two institutions are sufficiently weighty to justify this move, whether one considers the good of the entire English-speaking community of Montreal or of Loyola College itself.... Loyola was therefore pleased to note that, at the meeting of the Joint Steering Committee of the two institutions, the representatives of Sir George Williams agreed that further discussion of a full and complete merger was no longer fruitful and that the two sides should seriously discuss the possibility of federation... Loyola rejects the narrow view of federation in the Sir George Williams brief... We could discuss the creation of an English language University of Quebec which might include all present institutions or perhaps all institutions except McGill (i.e. Loyola, Sir George Williams, Bishop's, Marianopolis, Thomas More, St. Joseph Teachers College).... The Committee on the Future of Loyola has recommended that the President of Loyola open discussions with other university bodies in Quebec to inquire into the circumstances in which Loyola might associate with them.... In the context of the discussions between Loyola and Sir George, Loyola would view federation as the creation of a new federal university with Loyola and Sir George Williams as constituent

/8...

colleges as well as any other institutions involved."

April 8, 1969: J. P. Pétolas reported to the Joint Committee: "He had reported to Dr. Gauthier and Mr. Yves Martin the work of the Domestic and Joint Steering Committees and gained the impression from them that they were not so much interested in the forms which closer cooperation might take as in a quantitative analysis of, and report on, the combined resources (faculty, students, space, physical facilities) of our two institutions and how these resources could be most advantageously and economically used." It was agreed at this meeting that a two-man committee should study the implications of federation and produce a joint proposal.

June 13, 1969: Donald Savage and Michel Despland submitted their report. It proposed "vigorous decentralization in the area of Arts and centralization of professional education and scientific resources." There would be one Board of Governors, one Senate, one President, two Academic Vice-Presidents, a Vice-President (Finance and Administration), and a Vice-President (Student Services). There would be an Arts College on each campus. The Vanier Library at Loyola would be extended to include a research library, and a new Arts Building be constructed downtown. The University Faculties of Science, Engineering and Commerce would be located at SGWU. Both Arts Colleges would have their own Principal, Trustees and College Council. "The Trustees and Council of Loyola would protect

/9...

the Catholic identity of Loyola". A new Extension Department would operate on both campuses. Graduate Studies would be located in the Faculties.

November 19, 1969: Dr. O'Brien reported to the SGWU Committee that the Board of Governors and University Council had approved the Savage/Despland report as the basis for negotiations with Loyola.

December 11, 1969: Father Malone informed the Joint Committee that some members of Loyola faculty and trustees had "noted a number of discrepancies in the Despland/Savage report and that they had failed to give their entire approval." He indicated that the Loyola community wished to make the following five points:

- 1) Loyola's identity is to be protected along with its religious status; 2) Loyola wants to see diversity in the proposed federation, meaning that an Arts College has a need for contact with other faculties and requires services from certain faculties;
- 3) The Centre for Graduate Studies should be a joint Loyola/Sir George undertaking; 4) A physical education programme should be designed into the federation; 5) A desire to identify the educational advantages of a federation to the students." He also stated that: "The Loyola Senate Committee on the Future of Loyola recommends examining other possibilities of cooperation as well as the federation proposal with Sir George." Dr. O'Brien felt that accommodation could be reached on the five points. The Committee

/10...

agreed that: "Loyola move to obtain a resolution from the Loyola community", and a copy of the Savage/Despland report be sent to the Department of Education along with a progress report. (This was done on January 14, 1970).

July 14, 1970: Father Malone, Dr. R. H. Marchessault (Chairman of the Joint Committee of the Board of Trustees and the Senate on the Future of Loyola) and Dr. J. J. Lavery met Dr. Smola and Dr. Despland at SGWU to discuss Loyola proposals on federation.

September 10, 1970: Dr. O'Brien received from Dr. Marchessault a letter headed "July 14th Visit". In it, Dr. Marchessault said Loyola delegates had been disheartened by the "non-committal and almost disinterested attitude towards the proposal by the Sir George group." This proposal would preserve "the identities, philosophies and, to a great extent, the structures of both," whereas Savage/Despland allowed Loyola only one-sixth of the structures of the new university. "The reduction of Loyola to a liberal arts college would be a retrograde step back to 1945, to the old "collège classique" days in Quebec - and those are gone, gone." The Savage/Despland plan called for downtown construction that would likely be unacceptable to government. More likely to be accepted would be the location of Arts and Commerce at Loyola, Science and Engineering at SGWU. "Simply the Savage/Despland proposal suggests such a radical change in the philosophy and identity of Loyola as to make it unrecognizable, and furthermore academically unsound... the

/11...

whole upheaval can only spell disaster to Loyola while Sir George's Faculties of Commerce, Engineering and Science would be almost doubled overnight at our expense and to our detriment... The dual constituency which we propose will allow for separate operation under one administrative umbrella until more coordination and great cooperation can be mutually determined."

October 1, 1970: Dr. O'Brien answered Dr. Marchessault. He noted that the July 14 meeting had lasted two hours, and he could not accept the reference to a "non-committal and almost disinterested attitude". He noted the many months during which SGWU had been waiting to hear from Loyola about the Savage/Despland report, which received only passing reference at the July 14 meeting. Under it the Faculties of Science, Engineering and Commerce would be part of a new combined university, and SGWU would be reduced to a liberal arts college as much as Loyola. "We are now entering a period during which the rationalization of structures and the effective use of resources will be much more important than before. The number of students in English universities in Quebec will at best remain constant, and may well decline. The Council of Universities and the Department of Education are organizing themselves to insist on the elimination of duplications. The government is under severe pressure to practise economy... We feel that a plan which, in your words, "will allow for separate operation under one umbrella until more coordination and great cooperation can be

/12...

mutually determined" has not recognized the urgency of the challenge facing English-language university education... We also recall that, on July 14, you told us you were approaching McGill and the University of Quebec (whether with the same or a different proposal we do not know). It may well be that as a result of those conversations, or for other reasons, your plans have taken a different turn, and you are no longer interested in negotiations with Sir George Williams. I want to assure you that if such is the case, we would bear no ill will toward Loyola."

December 9, 1970: The Montreal Star reported: "Last week the Loyola board of trustees and the senate, in differing degrees of support, decided to pursue talks with SGWU aimed at merging the two schools. The board of trustees, composed of 15 laymen and 15 Jesuits, indicated: "We are willing to discuss the possibility of federation", but left open other alternatives, such as a separate university charter for the college. The senate, on the other hand, the senior academic body of administrators, faculty and students, adopted the principle of federation, implicitly rejecting the other alternatives... Dr. R. H. Marchessault, chairman of a Loyola committee studying the federation proposals said last week any encounter with SGWU would have to be a meeting of equals."

February 3, 1971: Dr. Marchessault answered Dr. O'Brien's letter of October 1, 1970, stating that recent resolutions of the Senate and Trustees "provide a new incentive for exploring the possibility

/13...

of federation between our institutions. Such a federation would undoubtedly take a number of years to consummate." Attached was a brief prepared by Prof. John Norris, "which attempts to rationalize the association of our two institutions in terms of economic criteria and academic logistics. This document has been reviewed by senior administrators at Loyola who are prepared to discuss its contents with representatives of Sir George Williams University. I would therefore like to suggest a meeting at some early date between four or five parties from each institution."

The Norris report proposed a Loyola Faculty of Arts and Science; a SGWU Faculty of Arts and Science; Associated University Faculties of Commerce, Engineering and Graduate Studies. At the departmental level it proposed the following criteria: courses and programs in which enrolment per section is perhaps ten or fewer students should be combined and offered at one institution; proposed new courses should be determined jointly; students should have access to courses at each institution. "The cooperation between departments envisaged above may lead to a single department in some cases." The Faculties of Commerce and Engineering should operate on both campuses. "Loyola is an undergraduate college. The graduate programmes offered by Sir George would remain unaltered in an Associated University." There was no *prima facie* case for integration of evening activities. The administration would be integrated on the academic side down to vice-president level, with five reporting deans.

/14...

April 15, 1971: Father Malone wrote to Yves Martin to report a joint meeting on the Norris paper. "The reaction of Principal O'Brien and his colleagues was a positive one and I believe that this augurs well for the future... Both parties will now inform their senior bodies and invite reactions to the proposal."

May 4, 1971: Father Malone wrote to Dr. O'Brien that the Board of Trustees had passed a resolution "to receive" the Norris paper; the Senate had accepted the report as a basis of further discussion.

May 17, 1971: Dr. Marchessault wrote Dr. O'Brien suggesting establishment of a critical path "which will provide some schedule for the achievement of the "criteria" outlined in the document". He suggested a formal agreement regarding the combination of small sections to be followed by serious inter-departmental discussions beginning in September, and in January, 1972 "the first application of the "criteria" in the form of shared half courses between the two institutions." Although the general attitude of department chairmen, he said, "was cautious, there was unquestionably a favourable reception to the ideas expressed therein."

May 31, 1971: Dr. O'Brien wrote to Father Malone that both the Board of Governors and University Council at SGWU had approved the document "as a basis for discussion". On the same day he wrote to Dr. Marchessault agreeing that a meeting should now be arranged.

/15...

June 21, 1971: It was noted at a joint meeting that no answer had yet been received to Father Malone's letter to the government. A proposal for federation would likely go to the Council of Universities. Loyola considered that government reaction should be felt out before "either institution referred the matter back to their senior bodies". There should be an exchange of basic information during the summer to allow an approach to government in the fall. SGWU expressed reservations about beginning with the merger of small sections. On the matter of structures, Loyola "would not hold out for an Arts and Science combination, whereas Sir George feels it would keep its present structure". SGWU indicated that "of greater interest will be the Government and the public reactions to a two-campus structure in line with the amount of money the government wants to put into education".

September 21, 1971: Dr. O'Brien reported to the SGWU Committee that the Department of Education envisaged two English-language universities in the Montreal area: "McGill more or less as it is now, and Sir George - but developed and strengthened". He was due to have a meeting with government representatives to discuss the implications of a merger with Loyola.

September, 1971: SGWU developed a position paper taking into account Loyola proposals and dealing with certain other aspects of

/16...

fusion. It proposed a unified administrative structure with five Faculties: Arts, Science, Commerce, Engineering and the Faculty of Loyola College. Both sides were generally in agreement about having single Faculties of Commerce and Engineering. In principle the Loyola Faculty of Science should be merged with that of SGWU, but, to meet Loyola desires, a Science division should be included in the Loyola academic structure. Each Faculty would be responsible for its evening programs. Arrangements would be made for Loyola participation in graduate work. "The non-academic administrative structure would be based on the concept of total integration, with each service or functional unit having such operations on either or both campuses as are appropriate." There would also be a senior administrator on the Loyola campus responsible for supervision of administrative operations. (This paper was sent to Loyola.)

November 5, 1971: A Loyola delegation called on the Minister of Education "to clarify certain matters affecting the role and juridical status of Loyola". The Minister was asked specifically if he would grant Loyola a charter, and stated that he would not. He also said: "The cabinet would not likely grant autonomy to Loyola". Father Malone ran over the recent report of the Committee on the Future of Loyola. In the new university, there would be a SGWU College with Faculties of Arts and Science, and the same at Loyola. Nearly complete autonomy would be given to each college.

/17...

There would be associated Faculties of Graduate Education, Commerce and Engineering. He referred to the plan to deal with classes with an enrolment of ten or less. "He then reviewed the history of discussions with Sir George in which it had not been possible to reconcile the positions of each institution sufficiently, even in point of the basis of discussions, to engender an atmosphere of mutual confidence and trust between "equal parties" in the talks." The Minister stated he had no preconceived position with regard to Loyola relations with SGWU, the University of Quebec or other institutions, but told the committee that a "universitarian" position for Loyola was assured. He said he could envisage a grouping of all English-language CEGEPs and universities along University of London lines.

December 2, 1971: The Board of Trustees of Loyola agreed "to explore with Sir George Williams University the formation of a new federated university, or a new mutually acceptable form of affiliation," and Loyola issued a press release to this effect.

December 14, 1971: A meeting between representatives of the Board of Trustees of Loyola and the Board of Governors of SGWU agreed to begin formal negotiations about the union of the two institutions.

January 19, 1972: The Joint Committee of the two Board received a position paper from Loyola, which Father Drummond proposed be given

/18...

the approval of the meeting. According to it, "There will be two equal institutions forming one University under a common charter... Each campus will retain its own traditions... The Joint Committee will accept the Norris Report as the basis for the work of its sub-committees." Dr. O'Brien drew attention to the SGWU paper, which Father Malone said had not been distributed at Loyola because he had understood it was confidential. It was agreed that an ad hoc committee composed of Malone, O'Brien, Bordan and Burke prepare guidelines for further negotiations.

February 16, 1972: Dr. O'Brien submitted a 7-point set of guidelines as the report of the ad hoc committee. He said the committee had held two meetings - on February 3 and 16. At the first there had been a measure of agreement on the document. "However the February 16 meeting had made it clear that it would be premature for the Joint Committee to adopt this document. He proposed that discussions should continue with a view to reconciling differences within such a document." Father Malone said "there existed some disagreement as to the meaning and intention of existing position papers, e.g. "integration" as opposed to "federation" and common understanding of the meaning of guidelines would have to be established." Dr. O'Brien said that the present document was satisfactory to SGWU. This version of the guidelines stated that the two entered into negotiations as equal institutions to establish a new University under a single charter. "Negotiations will pay due

/19...

attention to the traditions of each institution... Existing documents such as the Norris Report from Loyola and the SGWU paper dated September 1971 will be used in defining the areas in which recommendations are to be made."

March 7, 1972: A new 11-point set of guidelines proposed by the ad hoc committee was accepted by the Joint Committee. The two following paragraphs had been added:

"The new University will have two campuses, which will serve as an institutional framework for preserving those educational traditions of the two institutions which prove academically valuable and financially feasible according to appropriate criteria. It is nevertheless recognized that the new University, once established, must have the freedom to evolve its own character and structures. Further it will take some years for a definitive character to emerge."

"Negotiators will study the present purposes, strengths and weaknesses of the Faculties in each institution with a view to developing schedules either for integration or for various forms of co-ordination and cooperation, as seems desirable. They will be concerned to assure that each Faculty, whether operating on one or both campuses, is a viable and forward-looking entity, and that the structural arrangements they propose will most effectively serve the students of the new institution. They will thus enable to flourish those elements of the present diversity that are both

/20...

academically valuable and financially feasible."

It was also stated that in questions of interpretation the guidelines would take precedence over both the Norris report and the SGWU paper.

The guidelines were released to the press on March 28, 1972.

April 6, 1972: The Joint Committee reviewed a schedule submitted by ad hoc committee for implementation of the new University; formal establishment would take place early in the fall of 1972. The Loyola presentation to the Council of Universities was discussed. Father Malone said that "while the request had been made to Loyola, the report would in fact be a joint presentation of the path to union that the two institutions contemplated and agreed to informally by Loyola and Sir George... It was not likely to be a detailed outline but rather an indication of the course along which details of union would tend to go." C. A. Duff said that Sir George was ready to participate in order to further joint interests. Dr. O'Brien said the presentation should include the guidelines and related material as well as some indication of the proposed schedule for union. He felt the Council would be satisfied with some indication of the direction and speed and "some assurance that the institutions are seriously intending to do what they say they are going to do."

/21...

May 18, 1972: Loyola, SGWU, Bishop's and McGill appeared at Chicoutimi at a meeting of the Council of Universities, which was developing, at the request of the Minister of Education, a special report on the Orientations of the English-language university sector as part of its overall study of the Quebec university system. Loyola also, as requested, put in a written submission. This contained the following elements: I. Introduction; II. Loyola Today - Educational Philosophy; Educational Philosophy in Practice; Loyola's Community Role; Educational Constituency; Educational Grants; Educational Resources; Loyola's Contribution to the New University; III. The New University - The Agreed Guidelines; Discussion of Guidelines - One University; two campuses, educational requirements; two campuses, space requirements; rationalization, criteria; Summary: Letters from the Minister of Education: Report of the November 5, 1971 meeting with the Minister: Statistics on grants, actual and forecast Loyola enrolments, and on space: Criteria for departments operating on the Sir George and Loyola campuses prepared by J. Burke and dated March 27, 1972. (This submission was not discussed with SGWU before it was printed, and was first seen by SGWU representatives two days before the Chicoutimi meeting.)

The section on Educational Philosophy started out with this paragraph: "Loyola is unique among the institutions of higher education in Quebec. For seventy-five years, it has remained a Catholic College,

/22...

an institution of liberal education, and an undergraduate school. Its past traditions and present accomplishments flow from this tripartite identity. Its future hopes depend upon a new form of existence which will preserve and enrich this tradition."

It is also stated: "Although questions of moral values are posed in other institutions of higher education, they often reflect the commitment of individual professors and not the collective concern of the university. Such questions are central to Loyola's existence as a Catholic College... At Loyola, theology moves from the periphery to the center of university life, for here it is agreed, that all disciplines have moral and ethical dimensions....

"Loyola feels that graduate programs have been favored at the expense of undergraduate education. Undergraduates are often herded into larger and larger classes so that graduate students can be educated in smaller and smaller groups. Many undergraduate courses are abandoned to graduate assistants, because the "best professors" teach graduate courses and because graduate students need employment. All of Loyola's resources go to undergraduate education."

Referring, as an example, to the Loyola Faculty of Commerce, the submission stated: "The purpose of Loyola is thus: to try to give a general education, while at the same time, giving the necessary core of particular or vocational knowledge to the student... We do not deny the suitability for some students of a more intensive

/23...

approach and it is, for this reason, that we believe Sir George Williams and Loyola offer complementary approaches to undergraduate education."

Comparative grant figures were included. "It is clear that education at Loyola is substantially underfunded even when allowance has been made for its totally undergraduate nature. Loyola feels that its record of achievement on a meagre budget is notable. Loyola feels even more strongly that this record is the one thing which should not be duplicated in the New University."

Forecast enrolment figures were provided with the comment, "What is particularly notable about the above table is the relative constancy of the total number of students on the Loyola campus over the next five years."

"Loyola's Contribution to the New University" contained the following passage: "Within the New University we see Loyola's present resources being given added impetus and opportunity so that its chosen role as a centre of liberal innovative and undergraduate education can be further enhanced. This means that Loyola is concerned with the structures of the New University only to the extent that the structures should allow Loyola to strengthen those previously mentioned areas of particular emphasis and interest."

/24...

Reference was made in the same section to Loyola's lack of space. "Whereas others in Quebec look on the various norms as levels to which they may be required to descend, Loyola, from its position of deprivation, looks upwards to the norms hoping that its present position of grossly over-achieving the norms will some day be eased to that of the luxury of merely meeting them."

On "rationalization" of the New University, the submission stated: "The structure of the New University would tend to evolve from the bottom up, rather than from the top down, by a feedback process in which departmental requirements are tentatively identified, the consequent implications on higher structures examined, higher structures initially defined and the implications fed back to the departmental structures." Loyola's criteria for rationalization were attached as an appendix, with the note that: "Loyola and Sir George have not yet agreed upon a mutually acceptable set of criteria."

The criteria included the following: "The same courses currently offered at Loyola and Sir George Williams shall continue to be given on both campuses provided the enrolment in each is at least ten students per section."¹⁴ Various technical arrangements regarding adjustments of class size and course load followed. The criteria would be applied immediately, with 1974-75 the academic year in which courses that did not meet the criteria should be rationalized. Departmental evaluation teams should be set up in 1975-76. Joint

/25...

committees should work on the coordination of new courses and programs, and staffing.

July 13, 1972.